Ground Operations, Signing and Resource Mitigations for Travel Management (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700552

1. Project Description

A. Statement of GO Activity

The Inyo National Forest 2009 Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) designated a system of motorized roads and trails that can be used by OHV and motorized vehicles. Though most designated routes are stable and currently at an appropriate standard, there were a host of mitigations deemed necessary to allow for the long-term stable use of the system by OHV vehicles. Some of these mitigations were required to be performed before routes could be open for use, while others must be performed within a five year period.

The Travel Management ROD prescribed approximately 110 separate physical mitigations within the Forest's OHV Focus Area boundaries, and approximately 50 other recommended actions that will improve the stability of routes and resource conditions within these areas. Roughly 40 of the 160 are already planned for completion prior to the performance period of this grant cycle, using other funding sources. This project, combined with the matching work conducted through non-state funds, will accomplish the majority of the remaining prescribed mitigations, with an emphasis on 30 drainage and water diversion structures, barriers, hardening of road surfaces, and solving instability problems related to creek crossings and riparian habitat, and installation of seasonal closure gates.

For increased overall efficiency, the other recommended actions in the same areas will also be accomplished as part of Forest funding, depending upon level of planning and analysis needed or accomplished. This will increase the overall benefit of stabilization efforts within the Focus Areas.

This project will improve the conditions along the newly established system of roads and trails on the Forest by implementing the physical mitigations required to provide long-term stability. This project expands upon annual maintenance activities funded by both Federal funds and those requested in the forestwide ground operations project, and focuses explicitly on road improvements, resource mitigations, and route signing called for in the Travel Management Decision.

The road and trail improvements include a variety of maintenance, protection, and hardening measures designed to solve current resource issues and improve long-term route stability. The site specific activities includes the installation of barriers to keep users traveling within the roadway, hardening stream crossings to reduce the potential for erosion resulting from OHV travel, installation of gates to provide for seasonal access, and stabilization of road surfaces in riparian areas to protect sensitive areas. Each of these activities was identified as a necessary mitigation during the Travel Management analysis, and is outlined in the Implementation Strategy in the Record of Decision and in the facilities section of the FEIS. Each is also necessary to ensure that the newly established system of roads and trails on the Inyo remains sustainable ove the long-term.

Lastly, the signing activities include both route marking as well as educational and regulatory signing to make the designated travelway clear. This grant tiers to a previously funded OHV grant (2008/09) which established a sign atlas for the forest and that provided 1,000 route markers. The field work for this project will continue the work of installing signs and route markers along high priority Inyo National Forest System roads and trails. Attention will especially be paid to areas where travel has been confusing or where unique and important recreation opportunities require OHV travel. This effort would be consistent with and builds upon the previously funded CA OHMVR Grant, which produces an OHV Signing strategy and atlas.

The implementation of the project activities will be conducted after a short planning phase, which will include determining final design and necessary field clearances. With a focus on the routes recently established for the public to use, this project takes an important step to implement measures that were identified within the recently completed comprehensive Travel Management Analysis and decision (2009) and advances the Travel Management Implementation Strategy. In combination, these activities will help the Inyo National Forest establish critical ongoing maintenance of a sustainable

system of Roads and Trails for use by OHVs.

B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

The Travel Management Decision on the Inyo National Forest was a five-year analysis effort to establish a sustainable system of roads and trails for which the public could use motorized vehicles. During the analysis, the public provided comments, resource specialists visited the routes, and a collaborative group of stakeholders came together to recommend a system that would best support the public needs. It was found that many of these motorized routes had varying types and levels of effect on resources, but many also provided key opportunities for the motorized public. Approximately 1100 miles were added to the transportation system for motorized use. This newly established system is the backbone of the OHV opportunities on the Inyo National Forest.

The mitigation measures prescribed in the FEIS/ROD were determined necessary to ensure that this system of roads and trails will be sustainable. In addition, the activities of this project will establish conditions on this transportation system that will allow for future ongoing annual maintenance -- including those conducted by partners and vounteers -- to be more efficient and effective. In total, the maintenance, improvement, and resource protection activities are necessary to ensure that recreational OHV use on the transportation system remains consistent with the management of the resources on the Inyo National Forest.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

The focus of this effort is in the high priority OHV areas on the Inyo National Forest (within the nine OHV “focus areas”). This area encompasses over 300,000 acres of National Forest System lands and contains over 1,000 miles of OHV routes. The project will incorporate activities on over 100 miles of routes that require mitigation and routes with recommendations for further stabilization work. In addition to physical road/resource repairs and mitigations, it includes placement of gates at locations where seasonal access is allowed, placement of directional signs, system road identifiers, and regulatory signs. The work is confined to areas within and along the designated transportation system on the Inyo National Forest.

D. Location and description of OHV opportunities

The Inyo National Forest contains a large variety of terrain, from desert to high mountains, available for OHV use. The Forest has approximately 1.1 million acres outside of Wilderness areas, containing over 2,200 miles of roads and trails available for OHV use. In addition, the Forest grooms approximately 100 miles for OSVs, with approximately 252,000 acres available for OSV use on the northern end of the Forest. The Forest provides year-round OHV opportunities, and includes opportunities for a variety of vehicle types (i.e. ATV, motorcycle, side-by-sides, OSV, and 4x4 vehicles) and a range of skill levels.

The Forest has identified nine OHV “focus areas” (sometimes referred to as “Grant Areas”) where sufficient planning for Habitat Management Plan and Soil Conservation Plan have previously been conducted. The emphasis areas are spread throughout the Forest, and comprise roughly a third of the non-wilderness Forest area. This project is limited to the mitigations prescribed in the Travel Management EIS within these nine focus areas. The Forest intends to expand the areas to the rest of the Forest, so that mitigations and maintenance activities can be conducted on all roads and trails on the Forest [As described in the 2010 Ground Operations request submitted with the Forest's package.]

Completing the mitigations described in this project will open some routes that cannot currently be used by motorized traffic in the focus areas, as well as bring other roads and trails in the focus areas to an appropriate standard for long-term OHV use.

2. Rerouting Requirements

Rerouting

(a) Does your project involve rerouting of any roads and trails? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If response to question (a) is 'Yes', a Project timeline, conceptual drawings and site plans are required (See

'Attachments' tab at the top of the screen)

If response to question (a) is 'No', skip details related to rerouting

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700552

1. Project Timeline (Required if project includes necessary rerouting)

2. Conceptual Drawings and Site Plans (Required if project includes necessary rerouting)

Attachments:
- Map - Mitigation Roads - Monache FA
- Map - Mitigation Roads - Mazourka FA
- Map - Mitigation Roads - Poleta, Bristlecone FA

3 Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:
- INF OHV Focus Areas Overview
- Mitigation Roads - Coyote Focus Area
- Mitigation Roads - Lookout Loop, East Craters FA
- Mitigation Roads - McGee FA
- Mitigation Roads - Mono Basin FA

4. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents

Attachments:
- Photos - Mitigations needed - examples
- Photos - Mitigation treatment examples

Project Cost Estimate

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # _____		
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Inyo National Forest		
PROJECT TITLE :	Ground Operations, Signing and Resource Mitigations for Travel Management (FINAL)	**PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :**	G09-02-05-G02
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ Development ☐ Education & Safety ☑ Ground Operations ☐ Law Enforcement ☐ Planning ☐ Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	The Inyo National Forest 2009 Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) designated a system of motorized roads and trails that can be used by OHV and motorized vehicles. Though most designated routes are stable and currently at an appropriate standard, there were a host of mitigations deemed necessary to allow for the long-term stable use of the system by OHV vehicles. Some of these mitigations were required to be performed before routes could be open for use, while others must be performed within a five year period. The Travel Management ROD prescribed approximately 110 separate physical mitigations within the Forest's OHV Focus Area boundaries, and approximately 50 other recommended actions that will improve the stability of routes and resource conditions within these areas. Roughly 40 of the 160 are already planned for completion prior to the performance period of this grant cycle, using other funding sources. This project, combined with the matching work conducted through non-state funds, will accomplish the majority of the remaining prescribed mitigations, with an emphasis on 30 drainage and water diversion structures, barriers, hardening of road surfaces, and solving instability problems related to creek crossings and riparian habitat, and installation of seasonal closure gates. For increased overall efficiency, the other recommended actions in the same areas will also be accomplished as part of Forest funding, depending upon level of planning and analysis needed or accomplished. This will increase the overall benefit of stabilization efforts within the Focus Areas. This project will improve the conditions along the newly established system of roads and trails on the Forest by implementing the physical mitigations required to provide long-term stability. This project expands upon annual maintenance activities funded by both Federal funds and those requested in the forestwide ground operations project, and focuses explicitly on road improvements, resource mitigations, and route signing called for in the Travel Management Decision. The road and trail improvements include a variety of maintenance, protection, and hardening measures designed to solve current resource issues and improve long-term route stability. The site specific activities includes the installation of barriers to keep users traveling within the roadway, hardening stream crossings to reduce the potential for erosion resulting from OHV travel, installation of gates to provide for seasonal access, and stabilization of road surfaces in riparian areas to protect sensitive areas. Each of these activities was identified as a necessary mitigation during the Travel Management analysis, and is outlined in the Implementation Strategy in the Record of Decision and in the facilities section of the FEIS. Each is also necessary to ensure that the newly established system of roads and trails on the Inyo remains sustainable ove the long-term. Lastly, the signing activities include both route marking as well as educational and regulatory signing to make the designated travelway clear. This grant tiers to a previously funded OHV grant (2008/09) which established a sign atlas for the forest and that provided 1,000 route markers. The field work for this project will continue the work of installing signs and route markers along high priority Inyo National Forest System roads and trails. Attention will especially be paid to areas where travel has been confusing or where unique and important recreation opportunities require OHV travel. This effort would be consistent with and builds upon the previously funded CA OHMVR Grant, which produces an OHV Signing strategy and atlas.		

	The implementation of the project activities will be conducted after a short planning phase, which will include determining final design and necessary field clearances. With a focus on the routes recently established for the public to use, this project takes an important step to implement measures that were identified within the recently completed comprehensive Travel Management Analysis and decision (2009) and advances the Travel Management Implementation Strategy. In combination, these activities will help the Inyo National Forest establish critical ongoing maintenance of a sustainable system of Roads and Trails for use by OHVs.

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	**Staff**						
	Other-OHV Patrols and Laborers Notes : Two GS-5 employees, 50 days each at $150/day. Inventorying and installing signs.	100.000	150.000	DAY	15,000.00	0.00	15,000.00
	Other-Dist OHV Program Leads Notes : NZ and SZ OHV GS-9 program supervisors would coordinate implementation at the district level. Supervision of employees and volunteer coordination (i.e. training, quality control, etc.). Participate in Sign Atlas maintenance and tracking/reporting.	30.000	275.000	DAY	4,250.00	4,000.00	8,250.00
	Other-Project Coordinator Notes : GS-11--Project oversight, coordination with districts on route signing, sign atlas maintenance, and tracking accomplishments.	20.000	350.000	DAY	4,000.00	3,000.00	7,000.00
	Other-Maintenance Crew Notes : 3 person laborer crew. Crew may consist of various hiring sources, such as Forest Service hires, Friends of the Inyo, Student Conservation Association (SCA), and/or Youth Conservation Corps (YCC). Individual crewmembers may work with other organizations and manpower crews to direct implementation. Work will be focused on projects that either require only handwork, such as noxious weed treatments or handwork assisting equipment	180.000	200.000	DAY	36,000.00	0.00	36,000.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	operators.						
	Other-Maintenance Crew Supervisor Notes : WG7/8 - Lead field implementation efforts, including project oversight and organization, coordination with engineering equipment, and volunteer coordination. Maintenance crew supervisor provides oversight (hiring, training, directing work, quality control, and other logistics) of the crew during implementation.	60.000	300.000	DAY	18,000.00	0.00	18,000.00
	Other-Botanist Notes : GS-9/11--Field review and sensitive plant monitoring. Direct crews on noxious weed treatments.	10.000	350.000	DAY	2,000.00	1,500.00	3,500.00
	Other-Hydrologist Notes : GS-9/11--Field review and final project design.	10.000	350.000	DAY	1,500.00	2,000.00	3,500.00
	Other-Archaeologist Notes : GS-9/11--Field review and cultural resource site monitoring, and field clearances on unsurveyed work sites.	15.000	350.000	DAY	4,000.00	1,250.00	5,250.00
	Other-Equipment Operator Notes : WG 9??--Equipment operator implement road and trail improvements.	40.000	300.000	DAY	10,000.00	2,000.00	12,000.00
	Other-GIS specialist Notes : GS-9/11--Provide mapping support, maintain geodatabase for planning and tracking accomplishments spatially.	25.000	225.000	DAY	4,625.00	1,000.00	5,625.00
	Other-Volunteers Notes : Individual volunteers and sponsored volunteer groups. Community groups which collaborated in the Travel Management process, OHV user groups (Eastern Sierra 4-wheelers, Sneakers Motorcycle Group), Friends of the Inyo, Range of Light Sierra Club, etc.	60.000	130.000	DAY	0.00	7,800.00	7,800.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-District Staff/OHV Program Mgrs. Notes : GS-11--District OHV Program oversight, including coordination with Project Manager and Maintenance Crew Supervisor.	20.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	7,000.00	7,000.00
	Other-Forest Recreation Officer Notes : GS-13--OHV program oversight as part of Travel Management implementation.	4.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	1,600.00	1,600.00
	Other-Forest Engineer Notes : WS 11??--Provide supervision/direction, support to engineering crews and equipment operators.	10.000	475.000	DAY	0.00	4,750.00	4,750.00
	Other-Asst. Forest Engineer Notes : WS 9??--Provides coordination and management of engineering program and equipment administration, budget agreements, and tracking.	10.000	350.000	DAY	1,500.00	2,000.00	3,500.00
	Total for Staff				100,875.00	37,900.00	138,775.00
2	**Contracts**						
3	**Materials / Supplies**						
	Other-Carsonite Signs Notes : Posts, signs and stickers for route markers.	350.000	30.000	EA	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Other-Tools Notes : Miscellaneous tools and supplies. Rakes, shovels, pulaskis, carsonite sighn installer, etc.	1.000	2000.000	EA	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00
	Other-Personal Protective Equipment Notes : Gloves, goggles, hard hats, first aid kits, camping gear, etc.	1.000	2000.000	EA	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00
	Other-Geo-Fabric/Filter Cloth	2.000	300.000	YD	600.00	0.00	600.00
	Other-Signs - Metal	50.000	100.000	EA	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00
	Other-Gates	2.000	5000.000	EA	5,000.00	5,000.00	10,000.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Total for Materials / Supplies				23,100.00	7,000.00	30,100.00
4	**Equipment Use Expenses**						
	Other-Vehicle Mileage Notes : Estimated mileage for project implementation. OHV Patrols (Sign installers) Vehicles - 8,000 miles Project Manager Vehicle - 1500 miles Maintenance Crew Vehicles - 6,000 miles Maintenance Supervisor Vehicle - 4,000 miles Engineering Crew Vehicles - 10,000 miles Total = 30,000 miles	26500.00 0	0.500	MI	0.00	13,250.00	13,250.00
	Other-Vehicle FOR Notes : Monthly cost for vehicles in support of the project. OHV Patrol (sign installer) vehicles - 10 months Project Manager Vehicle - 4 months Maintenance Crew Vehicles - 6 months Maintenance Crew Supervisor Vehicle - 6 months Engineering Crew Vehicles - 4 months Total = 30 months	30.000	325.000	MOS	0.00	9,750.00	9,750.00
	Other-Engineering Equipment Notes : Backhoe -- FOR= $662/mo, Use = $14/hr (Est $2000) Dump Truck -- FOR = $750/mo, Use = $1.30/mi (Est $2500) Front End Loader -- $1110/mo, Use= $18/hr ($2000) Motor Grader -- FOR = $1358, Use = $14/hr (Est $5,500) Tractor Trailer -- FOR = $725/mo, Use = 1.14/mi (Est $2000) Transport Trailer -- FOR = $300 (Est $600) Dozer -- FOR = $1100, Use = $13/hr (Est $600) TOTAL Equip = 15,200	15200.00 0	1.000	EA	0.00	15,200.00	15,200.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				0.00	38,200.00	38,200.00
5	**Equipment Purchases**						
6	**Others**						
	Other-Field Per Diem Notes : Per Diem for camping overnight for the sites that are located in remote locations. Increases crew efficiency by reducing travel time/salary cost.	100.000	54.000	DAY	5,400.00	0.00	5,400.00
7	**Indirect Costs**						
	Indirect Costs-Indirect Costs Notes : Project Coordination and Grant Administration, including program oversight, supervision, budgeting, tracking budget/expenditures, billing, record keeping, etc.).	1.000	12000.000	MISC	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
Total Program Expenses					129,375.00	95,100.00	224,475.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					129,375.00	95,100.00	224,475.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					**129,375.00**	**95,100.00**	**224,475.00**

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	100,875.00	37,900.00	138,775.00	
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	23,100.00	7,000.00	30,100.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	38,200.00	38,200.00	Forest Service vehicles costs, other than those purchased with OHV funds, are charged per mile as well as a monthly "rental rate" which is the "FOR."
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	5,400.00	0.00	5,400.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		129,375.00	95,100.00	224,475.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		129,375.00	95,100.00	224,475.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		**129,375.00**	**95,100.00**	**224,475.00**	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Version # _____	APP # 700552

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 2

b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a “Project” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? (Please select Yes or No) ◉ Yes ○ No

d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

As analyzed in the Inyo National Forest Travel Management FEIS, the majority of the projects/mitigations prescribed in the document are designed to increase the stability of the road and trail system and will have long-term beneficial effects to wetlands and riparian habitats. Other projects are designed to benefit other sensitive resources, such as cultural sites.

The project includes mitigations such as drainage work (waterbars), stabilizing creek crossings, installing barriers to ensure that vehicles are confined to existing roadways, and hardening of erosive road surfaces in riparian and meadow areas by placing rock and gravels on the travelway. These will result in reduced erosion and sedimentation in sensitive habitats, and improved habitat condition for riparian-dependent species. The activities are expected to have beneficial effects on riparian areas, springs, and meadows and on overall condition of of the native vegetation community and watershed condition.

Prior to implementation of ground-disturbing mitigations, final design and layout with crew supervisors -- including how to implement Best Management Practices (BMP) and other site-specific design criteria will be conducted. These will limit the potential effects on water quality and sensitive resources.

Additional analysis and effects of mitigations prescribed in the Travel Management EIS can be found in Chapter 3 of the EIS; primarily in the Water Resources section 3.7.4.2, pg 229 ("Effects of Mitigation Measures"). Effects of mitigation measures on Aquatic Species (pg 468), Botanical resources (Pg 278), and Terrestrial Biota (pg 336) are also outlined in the EIS, and apply to this project, as well as mitigations that could occur in other efforts outside of the defined Focus Areas. A link to the EIS and Record of Decision is attached to this section.

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

Since the direct and indirect long-term effects of this project are projected to be beneficial, when combined with other activities in these areas -- including other efforts to reduce route proliferation and to ensure that motorized use is confined to the designated system -- the cumulative effects on natural and cultural resources will also be beneficial. Mitigations will not disperse use to other areas, and will in fact open up certain routes that are not currently available to motorized use, thereby enhancing the motorized recreational opportunities in these Focus Areas. Over the long-term, the increased stability is expected to provide for a sustainable transportation system and long-term reduced maintenance costs, by bringing the roads and trails to maintainable standard.

Other discussions of cumulative effects of Travel Management activities is available in the Inyo NF 2009 Travel Management FEIS, attached to this section.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

As described in the project description and in other sections of the ERDS, a primary objective of most of the mitigations is to retard off-site soil erosion and sedimentation currently present on the road and trail system. The site-specific prescriptions will ensure that the techniques used are appropriate to reduce erosion, confine motorized activities to existing (or smaller) compacted areas, increase native vegetation, and restore soil productivity.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

Only a few of the roads requiring mitigations are within the viewshed of Designated Scenic Highway 395. The actual mitigations are unlikely to be visible from the highway, and once implemented would not contribute to visual intrusion beyond that present by the existing road or trail. When signs are placed as part of prescribed mitigation, these will be designed to blend into the landscape, since they will be small in size, typically brown, and would not likely even be visible, except for very short term from a moving vehicle or from vantage points along the highway. No adverse effects to visual resources are anticipated from the implementation of this project.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

Some of the mitigations prescribed by the Travel Management EIS/ROD are intended to reduce effects of motorized use on cultural resources. These include some of the signs and barriers which are designed to keep vehicles on existing travelways, and reduce potential for driving onto sites. Other mitigations not directly prescribed for cultural resource protection have been evaluated in the EIS, (Chapter 3, section 3.5.4.2, pg 159). When there are potential cultural resources in the vicinity of another mitigation, a forest Archeaologist will be present and/or will prescribe specific design criteria in advance. All activities will meet obligations prescribed in the Programmatic Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office.

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

This project is not anticipated to have significant indirect effects within the project area or off-site. As described elsewhere in this ERDS, the mitigations will not displace users to other areas, and will actually ensure that some routes will be made available to motorized use, once the mitigations are accomplished. Over the long-term, these treatments will ensure a more stable road and trail system.

Based on the analysis in the 2009 Travel Management EIS, and past experience from implementing similar treatments on motorized routes, this project should not result in adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to physical, cultural, or recreational resources.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments: Link to 2009 Inyo Travel Management FEIS/ROD

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700552

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the cost of the Project covered by the Applicant is 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 76% or more (10 points)
- ○ 51% - 75% (5 points)
- ◉ 26% - 50% (3 points)
- ○ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Failure to Complete - Q 2.

2. Failure to complete the Project would result in: 8

(Check all that apply) : Maximum of 8 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Loss of OHV Opportunity (6 points)
- ☑ Negative impact to cultural sites (2 points)
- ☑ Damage to special-status species or other sensitive habitat (2 points)
- ☑ Potential trespass (2 points)
- ☐ Additional damage to Facilities (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The purpose of this project is to implement the suite of mitigations outlined in the Travel Management EIS (2009) to reduce natural and cultural resource impacts and provide for a quality OHV experience. The mitigations are designed to ensure OHV users stay on designated routes, improve water quality, protect sensitive plant populations, and cultural sites. Signs would be installed that identify National Forest System routes that are open to public use, which will significantly improve the overall quality of OHV opportunities. The proposed signage would allow OHV users to find/know where they are at. This project would also reduce incursions into closed routes and lessen impacts to heritage resources, sensitve plants, and riparian areas that result from routes that are not open for such use. Mitigations such as barriers and signage are proposed to protect sensitive plant populations such as the Mono Lake Lupine and Mono Milkvetch in sand flat habitat.

3. Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 3.

3. The Project would sustain OHV Opportunity by 12

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☑ Maintaining trail or road tread (5 points)
- ☑ Installing or repairing erosion control features (3 points)
- ☑ Providing traffic control and/or educational signage (3 points)
- ☑ Maintaining multi use (ATV, Dirt Bikes, 4x4, etc) (1 point)
- ☐ Providing varied levels of riding difficulty (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The project proposes drainage work, hardening and repair of stream crossings to maintain the route tread and update erosion control features, and Installing signs to mark National Forest System routes that are open for motorized vehicle use. Other signs are prescribed to educate visitors about sensitive habitat and cultural resource protection. The project will ensure OHV users are on open, legal trails and lessen the risk of off-road incursion and trespass. In many areas on the Forest, OHV users disturb highly erosive soils when they inadvertantly travel off system roads and trails due to the lack of signage directing them to proper use areas. Signs limiting visitors to the use of certain vehicle classes will help ensure that trails used by ATVs and Motorcycles remain as narrow, singletrack opportunities. It is expected that by implementing the prescribed Travel Management mitigations, off-site soil erosion and stream sedimentation will be reduced.

4. Public Input - Q 4.

4. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) : Maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- [ ] Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- [x] Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The topic has been discussed over multiple stakeholder meetings, including the OHV leadership forum and local sessions on the Ranger Districts. Numerous public meetings were held during the development of the Travel Management EIS. Additionally, a collaborative public group made recommendations on the Travel Management plan as to which routes they would like to see mitigation on. The proposed mitigations were discussed during two different public field trips aimed at examining OHV opportunities and Travel Management planning on the Forest during the fall of 2008.

5. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 5.

5. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 2

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 4 or more (4 points)
- ◉ 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ○ 1 (1 point)
- ○ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Advocates for Access to Public Lands (AAPL), Friends of the Inyo (FOI), Eastern Sierra 4-wheel drive club, and other local OHV clubs.

6. Impact to Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 6.

6. The Project will avoid and/or minimize impact to natural and cultural resources by 5

(Check all that apply) : Maximum of 7 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Maintaining physical barriers to control OHV use (1 point)
- [x] Protecting water quality (1 point)
- [ ] Providing bridges instead of wet crossings where appropriate (1 point)
- [x] Protecting special-status species (1 point)
- [x] Re-routing trails to divert away from riparian/wetlands areas (1 point)
- [ ] Providing sanitary facilities (1 point)
- [x] Protecting cultural site(s) (1 point)
- [ ] Site design precludes the need for the above measures (7 points)

Explain each statement that was checked

As described under evaluation criteria number 2, the purpose of this project is to implement mitigations outlined in the Travel Management EIS (2009) to reduce impacts to natural and cultural resources. It is expected that the mitigations will improve water quality, enhance riparian areas and reduce impacts to sensitive plants and heritage resources. Barriers and signage mitigations should reduce incursions onto unauthorized routes that are closed to motor vehicle use and the inadvertant impacts to heritage resources, sensitve plants, and riparian areas that result from routes that are not open for such use.

7. Recycled Materials - Q 7.

7. The Project incorporates recycled materials by utilizing 3

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Barrier materials which include recycled content or materials obtained onsite (1 point)
- [x] Signs, sign posts or education kiosks which use products with recycled content (1 point)
- [ ] Erosion control features which use materials with recycled content (1 point)
- [x] Paper used for trail maps which includes recycled content (1 point)
- [ ] Other products with recycled content (Specify) (1 point)

8. Sustainable Technologies - Q 8.

8. The Project makes substantial use of sustainable technologies such as 0

- Alternative fuel vehicles and equipment
- Renewable energy sources (e.g., solar, wind)
- Low volatile organic compound emission materials (e.g., paint, sealants, carpet)
- Low flow plumbing fixtures
- Water efficient landscaping

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- (•) No (No points)
- ( ) Yes (4 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

9. Motorized Access - Q 9.

9. The Project improves and/or maintains facilities that provide motorized access to the following non-motorized recreation opportunities 6

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each, up to a maximum of 6 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Camping
- [x] Birding
- [x] Hiking
- [ ] Equestrian trails
- [x] Fishing
- [x] Rock Climbing
- [x] Other (Specify) [Photography, Rock hounding, hunting, pleasure driving, mountain biking, skiing,]